Remarks

Claims 1-24 are pending, but stand rejected. Claims 16-18 and 20 have been amended to correct typographical errors. In view of the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's thoughtful reconsideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §112

Claims 16-18 were rejected under §112. To address the Examiner's concerns, Claims 16-18 have been amended so that each depends from 15 rather than claim 14.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-17, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,613,160 issued to Kraslavsky

Claim 1 is directed to a method of transmitting a message and recites the following elements:

   a. transmitting a message to a remote destination when each of a set of pre-determined conditions exist, the pre-determined conditions include:

      a. a device encounters an event while processing a job; and
      b. the job meets a pre-determined criterion.

In support of the rejection the Examiner cites:
   - Kraslavsky, Fig. 1;
   - Kraslavsky, col. 1 line 60 through col. 2, line 5;
   - Kraslavsky, col. 14, line 32,
   - Kraslavsky, col. 15, line 34;
   - Kraslavsky, col. 16, line 66 through col. 17, line 16;
   - Kraslavsky, col. 20, lines 24-39,
   - Kraslavsky, table 8; and
   - Kraslavsky, claim 13.

6

Nothing in Kraslavsky, including the cited passages, figure, table, and claim, teaches or suggests a method in which a message is transmitted to a remote location when (a) a device encounters a condition while processing a job, and (b) that job meets a pre-determined criterion as recited by Claim 1.

Kraslavsky, Fig. 1 simply illustrates a block diagram of a local area network.

Kraslavsky, col. 1 line 60 through col. 2, line 5 describes a problem in which a printer is not placed in a safe default configuration at the end of a print job. The passage mentions nothing of encountering an event while processing a print job, that the print job meets a pre-determined criterion, or transmitting a message to a remote destination.

Kraslavsky, col. 14, line 32 is taken from a paragraph that describes configuration data for a printer and corresponding data logs that can include various information. That paragraph mentions nothing of encountering an event while processing a print job, that the print job meets a pre-determined criterion, or transmitting a message to a remote destination.

Kraslavsky, col. 15, line 34 is taken from a paragraph that describes advantages of bi directional communication between a printer and an NED (Network Expansion Board). That paragraph mentions nothing of encountering an event while processing a print job, that the print job meets a pre-determined criterion, or transmitting a message to a remote destination.

Kraslavsky, col. 16, line 66 through col. 17, line 16 is reproduced as follows:

> Steps S9 through S12 comprise a so-called "autologging" function which is carried out in the NEB by the CPSOCKET program in order to automatically and systematically provide status information from the printer to the LAN (autologging will be discussed in greater detail in section 4k below). In Step S9, if midnight has not been reached the procedure advances to Step S13. However, once midnight is reached, the NEB microprocessor 216 transmits a request to the printer over the SCSI bus for the printer to return current status to the NEB. For example, the printer may return the cumulative number of pages printed to the NEB. In Step S11, the NEB microprocessor 216 calculates printer statistics such as pages per job or pages per day, the NEB having kept track of the number of jobs sent to the printer and the date. At Step S12,

7

the printer statistics are transferred to a non-volatile memory such
as the printer's hard disk 114 or NVRAM 111, or the NEB's NVRAM
228. Alternatively, Steps S10, S11, S12 may be performed before
Step S9, so that statistics are stored every minute.

To summarize, the passage describes that upon a determination that once the
time of midnight is reached an NEB microprocessor (216) transmits a request for
a printer to return status information to the NEB (2). The passage mentions
nothing of transmitting a message to a remote destination upon the existence of
predetermined conditions that include a device encountering an event while
processing a job and the job meeting a pre-determined criterion.

Kraslavsky, col. 20, lines 24-39, is reproduced as follows:

At Step S28, the microprocessor 216 retrieves the requested
status data from DRAM 220, assembles the status data, and sends
it to the LAN through the LAN interface (to be discussed in greater
detail in section 4i below). Thus, in Step S28, more than simple
"on/off" information may be transmitted to the LAN so as to inform
the LAN of the detailed status of the printer. In a broad application,
Step S28 encompasses the export of printer front panel status over
the LAN, and the import of front panel control commands from the
LAN. That is, the network administrator at the PC 14 may request
and receive a display indicating all of the printer information
included on the printer front panel display 116. The network
administrator may then activate different printer front panel
functions on his/her PC, and such functions will be transmitted to
the printer where the selected control will be effected.

To summarize, the passage describes that the NEB microprocessor (216), after
obtaining and assembling status data, sends the assembled data to the local
area network. While the passage mentions sending data to a remote location,
the sending of data is not conditioned upon the existence of predetermined
conditions as recited by claim 1. Specifically, Kraslavsky's NEB microprocessor
(216) does NOTt send the assembled data when each of a set of pre-determined
conditions exist where those pre-determined conditions include (a) a device

8

encountering an event while processing a job, and (b) the job meeting a pre-determined criterion.

Kraslavsky, Table 8, is a list of status conditions. The relevance of Table 8 to claim 1 is suspect at best. The status conditions are NOT a set of predetermined conditions as recited by Claim 1. At best, they simply reflect data that can be transmitted to a remote location.

Kraslavsky, claim 13, simply describes a processor that periodically stores status data generated by a printer and also transmits that data in response to a request. Plainly, the language of Kraslavsky's claim 13 requires that the data be sent in response to a request and NOT upon the existence of a set of predetermined conditions as recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Claim 1 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are Claims 2-9 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 1.

Claim 10 is directed to a method of transmitting a message and recites the following elements:

a. receiving input that specifies at least one print job criterion and an e-mail address;
b. submitting a print job to a printer for processing;
c. if the print job meets the at least one print job criterion and the printer encounters an event while processing the print job, then transmitting an e-mail message to the e-mail address.

As clarified above with respect to Claim 1, Kraslavsky simply does not teach or suggest the sending of an e-mail message (or any other type of message) if a print job meets a specified criterion. Moreover, the Examiner does not even assert that Kraslavsky teaches or suggest a method that includes receiving input that specifies at least one print job criterion and an e-mail address and then, if a criterion is met, transmitting an e-mail message to the e-mail address.

9

For at least these reasons, Claim 10 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are Claims 11-14 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 10.

Claim 15 is directed to a computer readable medium embodying a program of instructions for causing a computer to perform the followings:

(a)   receiving a request from a user to print a document:

(b)   in response to the request, performing the following substeps:

   (i)   accessing the document to determine if the document has at least one characteristic;

   (ii) submitting a print job that describes the document to a printer; and

   (iii) if the print document has the at least one characteristic, commanding a device to transmit a message to a pre-determined address if the printer encounters an event while processing the print job.

As clarified above with respect to Claims 1 and 10, Kraslavsky simply does not teach or suggest the sending of a message (or any other type of message) to a predetermined address if a printer encounters an event while processing a print job. Moreover, the Examiner does not even assert that Kraslavsky teaches or suggest a method that includes accessing a document to determine if the document has at least one characteristic.

For at least these reasons, Claim 15 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are Claims 16-18 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 15.

Claim 19 is directed to a computing system that includes the following elements:

   a.   means for receiving input from a user that specifies at least one print job criterion;

10

b. means for receiving a request from the user to submit a print job to
    a printer;

c. means for responding to the request by submitting the print job to
    the printer; and

d. means for transmitting a message to an address if the print job
    meets the at least one criterion and the printer encounters an event
    while processing the print job.

As clarified above with respect to Claim 1, Kraslavsky simply does not
teach or suggest means for transmitting a message to an address if the print job
meets the at least one criterion and the printer encounters an event while
processing the print job. Moreover, the Examiner does not even assert that
Kraslavsky teaches or suggest a method that includes receiving input that
specifies at least one print job criterion.

For at least these reasons, Claim 19 is patentable over Kraslavsky as are
Claims 20-24 due at least in part to their dependence from Claim 15.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over
USPN 6,613,160 issued to Kraslavsky in view of USPN 5,778,183 issued to
Fillon. Claim 9 depends from Claim 1 and includes all the limitations of that base
claim. For at least the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 9.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §103

Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being
unpatentable over USPN 6,613,160 issued to Kraslavsky in view of USPN
5,778,183 issued to Fillon in further view of USPN 5,751,961 Issued to Smyk.
Claim 12 depends from Claim 10 and includes all the limitations of that base
claim. Claim 18 depends from Claim 15 and includes all the limitations of that
base claim. For at least the same reasons Claims 10 and 15 is patentable, so
are Claim 12 and 18.

11

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-24 define allowable subject matter. The Examiner is requested to indicate the allowability of all claims in the application and to pass the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson

By _____
Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

October 6, 2005

12